

## REMARKS

Claims 11-26 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined and remain in the form previously considered. Claims 27-30 are now being added. For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in the Office Action dated February 19, 2010.

Claims 11, 13-22, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,414,635 (Stewart). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 11 distinguishes over Stewart at least by reciting, “said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area.” Stewart fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms or providing information about trusted computed platforms to a visiting device.

The Office Action, page 3, section 4.a.ii notes that Stewart teaches a portable computing device (PCD) 110 equipped with a digital certificate, while section 4.a.iii(1) indicates that it would have been obvious to “have modified the invention of Stewart to clearly state the portable computing device (PCD) 110 is a trusted computing platform.” Applicants disagree with this assertion. However, assuming for the sake of argument that employing a digital certificate in PCD 110 suggests modifying PCD 110 to be or include a trusted computing platform as indicated in the Office Action, such modification does not suggest the subject matter of claim 11. Claim 11 recites, “said information system being arranged to provide said information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area.” In contrast, the system of Stewart even if modified as suggested in the Office Action transfers certificate information from the visiting device to the network for identification of the visiting device. See, for example, Stewart, column 10, lines 27-30. Accordingly, Stewart teaches identification information that flows in the opposite direction from the information flow recited in claim 11.

Further, it would not have been obvious to modify the teaching of Stewart to enable “interaction with trusted components of said trusted computing platforms.” As described in Applicants’ disclosure, a trusted component provides hardware that is inviolate and uses

physical connectivity of hardware to thwart the actions of malicious software in a trusted computing platform. Interactions can thus be conducted with a high level of trust because trusted component avoids many security risks in a computing platform. However, if the provided information regarding trusted computing platforms is untrustworthy, the security advantages provided by trusted computing platforms may not be fully achieved. Stewart is not concerned with and does not suggest how to provide a visitor with information that the visitor can trust to a confidence level provided by trusted computing platforms and enable interactions with the trusted computing platforms.

For the above reasons, claim 11 is patentable over Stewart.

Claims 13-20 depend from claim 11 and are patentable over Stewart for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable over Stewart.

Claim 15 further distinguishes over Stewart by reciting, “said apparatus for communicating or interacting with the portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication.” Stewart does not employ or suggest a system requiring physical contact of the portable device to the access point, particularly because Stewart teaches locating a user that is away from any access point. Further, although Stewart does disclose determining a bearing or direction to the portable device as disclosed in col. 3, lines 47-53, Stewart does not disclose or suggest a directional wireless communications as recited in claim 15. In particular, Stewart does not suggest that wireless communications be limited to a specific direction. In regard to claim 15, the Office Action, page 4, section 4.d. cites Stewart, Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 15-31. However, the cited portions of Stewart illustrate or describe wireless communication (i.e., not contact) and Stewart provides no indication that the wireless communication is directional. In accordance with an aspect of Applicants’ invention, a user can better trust information received by a portable device when the user knows the source of the information. Physical contact or directional wireless communication allows a user to identify the source by human perception/sight, which is not suggested by Stewart.

Independent claim 21 distinguishes over Stewart at least by reciting “retrieving to the information access point information relating to trusted computing platforms within the geographical area; and providing the information from the information access point to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area.” As noted above, Stewart fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms or providing

information relating to trusted computing platforms to a visiting portable computing apparatus. Accordingly, claim 21 is patentable over Stewart.

Claims 22, 24, and 25 depend from claim 21 and are patentable over Stewart for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over Stewart.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 12 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Stewart in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,937,066 (Gennaro). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11, which is patentable over Stewart for at least the reasons given above. In particular, Stewart fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms or providing information to a visiting device to enable interactions with the trusted computing platforms in a geographic area. Gennaro is directed to cryptographic key recovery and in that context, discloses transmission of public keys. However, Gennaro like Stewart does not describe or address trusted computing platforms or ways to enable a visiting portable computer to interact with local trusted computing platforms. Accordingly, the above reasoning used to show that claim 11 is patentable over Stewart also applies to the combination of Stewart and Gennaro, and claim 12 is patentable over the combination of Stewart and Gennaro for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable over Stewart and Gennaro.

Claim 23 depends from claim 21, which is patentable over Stewart for at least the reasons given above. In particular, Stewart fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms or providing information to a visiting device to enable interactions with the trusted computing platforms in a geographic area. Since Gennaro like Stewart does not describe or address trusted computing platforms or ways to enable a visiting portable computer to interact with local trusted computing platforms, the above reasoning used to show that claim 21 is patentable over Stewart also applies to the combination of Stewart and Gennaro. Accordingly, claim 21 and claim 23, which depends from claim 21, are patentable over the combination of Stewart and Gennaro.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 27-30 are added. Claim 27 depends from claim 21 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable. New independent claim 28 is patentable at least for reciting, an “information access point including an apparatus for retrieving information needed for interaction with trusted components of the trusted computing platforms and an interface arranged to provide the information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the geographical area.” New claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 28.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application including claims 11-30.

Respectfully submitted,

/David Millers 37396/

David Millers  
Reg. No. 37,396